



OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

February 3, 2003

Ms. Cynthia J. Hill  
Attorney  
Texas Department of Information Resources  
P.O. Box 13564  
Austin, Texas 78711-3564

OR2003-0700

Dear Ms. Hill:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 175867.

The Texas Department of Information Resources (the "department") received a request for the four evaluated proposals submitted to the department in response to a specified request for offer. You state that you have released a portion of the requested information to the requestor. However, you assert that the remaining requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of Catapult Systems Corporation ("Catapult"), CIBER, Inc. ("CIBER"), and Comsys Information Technology Services, Inc. ("Comsys"). You state that you have notified these parties of the request for information pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Public Information Act in certain circumstances). The department submitted the information at issue to this office. We also received correspondence from Catapult. We have considered these arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

We note at the outset that portions of the requested information have been designated as confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Public Information Act (the "Act") simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any agreement specifying otherwise.

In regard to the responsive information concerning CIBER and Comsys, an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, CIBER and Comsys have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that any of the submitted information relating to CIBER and Comsys is proprietary. *See, e.g.*, Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Therefore, the responsive information relating to CIBER and Comsys is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110.

We note, however, that the proposal submitted by Comsys is copyrighted. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In regard to portions of its proposal, Catapult raises section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. Gov't Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

After reviewing the correspondence submitted by Catapult, we conclude that Catapult has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release of its proposal would likely result in substantial competitive harm to Catapult. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). Thus, Catapult has failed to demonstrate that any of its information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Catapult also asserts section 552.102 of the Government Code in regard to certain personnel information. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure

“[i]nformation in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” This exception is applicable only to information contained in the personnel file of an employee of a governmental body. See *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.--Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision Nos. 473 at 3 (1987), 444 at 3-4 (1986), 423 at 2 (1984). As Catapult's personnel information does not relate to governmental employees, it may not be withheld under section 552.102.

Additionally, Catapult asserts that disclosure of certain personnel information would constitute an invasion of privacy. Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. For information to be protected from public disclosure under common-law privacy, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Information may be withheld from the public when (1) it is highly intimate and embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. *Id.* at 685; Open Records Decision No. 611 at 1 (1992). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Having reviewed Catapult's proposal, we conclude that none of its personnel information is highly intimate or embarrassing. Therefore, this information is not protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld under section 552.101.

Finally, we note that the submitted information relating to Catapult and CIBER contains e-mail addresses of members of the public that may be excepted from disclosure. Section 552.137 of the Government Code makes certain e-mail addresses confidential and provides in relevant part:

- (a) An e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.
- (b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address or a business's general e-mail address or web address. Accordingly, unless consent to release has been granted, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, we conclude that, unless consent to release has been granted, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the

Government Code. All other information must be released in compliance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 175867

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steve C. Kahle  
Managing Partner  
White Lion Internet Agency  
701 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Second Floor  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sam T. Goodner  
CEO  
Catapult Systems Corp.  
3001 Bee Caves Road, Suite 220  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Hudson  
Vice President/Area Director  
CIBER Inc.  
7800 Shoal Creek Blvd., Suite 124S  
Austin, Texas 78757  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Traci Peters  
Account Manager  
Comsys Information Technology Services, Inc.  
8200 North Mopac, Suite 240  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(w/o enclosures)